

REMARKS

The Office Action dated May 25, 2010, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments and following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto. Claims 1-5 and 7-31 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 26 is amended for clarification purposes only. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration on the part of the Examiner as the Amendment merely clarifies the claimed features of the invention; (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; and (d) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The Amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented because it is made in response to objections raised in the Final Rejection. Entry of the Amendment is thus respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-2, 5, 7, 13-14, 16-19 and 21-31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Borkovsky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,440,941) in view of Rogson (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0010726); claims 3-4, 9, 15 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Borkovsky in view of Rogson and Toner et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0024760); claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Borkovsky in view of Rogson and Bellany et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0078024); and claims 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Borkovsky in view of Rogson and Murakami et al.

(U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0181759). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

In particular, the current application claims a method for tolerating writing variations in input data when processing a data record for finding a counterpart in a reference data set, including determining in the data record a value of a data field, the data field representing an identifier, determining from a set of predetermined identifier values at least one synonym candidate for the value of the data field using a candidate selection criterion, determining if a synonym candidate and the value of the data field fulfill a predetermined synonym acceptance criterion based on at least one quality parameter, wherein said at least one quality parameter takes into account writing variations that are evaluated based on differences in the value of the data field and the synonym candidate, and when the predetermined synonym acceptance criterion is fulfilled, associating the value of the data field and the synonym candidate as synonyms and automatically updating a synonym set representing known writing variations for the identifier in a computer readable database and referencing to respective entries in the reference data set by adding the value of the data field to the synonym set without intervention of a user before searching for a counterpart, and searching for the counterpart for the data record by comparing the value of the data field to entries of the reference data set and/or the synonym set after the step of determining if the predetermined synonym acceptance criterion is fulfilled, wherein, if the synonym set was updated, said comparison to the synonym set comprises comparison to the updated synonym set in the computer readable database, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 21 and 24-31.

Borkovsky teaches a method and apparatus for suggesting an alternative spelling for a search query (Abstract). The Office Action impliedly admits that Borkovsky fails to teach the claimed features of determining if a synonym candidate and the value of the data field fulfill a predetermined synonym acceptance criterion based on at least one quality parameter, wherein said at least one quality parameter takes into account writing variations that are evaluated based on differences in the value of the data field and the synonym candidate, automatically updating a synonym set representing known writing variations for the identifier in a computer readable database, and adding the value of the data field to the synonym set without intervention of a user before searching for a counterpart, and relies on Rogson to cure these deficiencies (Office Action, page 5, line 15 to page 6, line 6).

Rogson teaches a “method and software for automatically updating a spell checking static update list by watching the user’s typing and learning what words the user intended” (paragraph [0009]). For example, Rogson teaches that “[w]hen a user enters a misspelled word...dynamic update 535 checks to see if the user corrects the misspelling” (paragraph [0026]). Accordingly, Rogson requires the presence of a user in order to perform its invention. Rogson, as well as Borkovski, cannot function properly without a user. In addition, having either Rogson or Borkovsky operate without a user would render either reference unsatisfactory for its intended purpose and would change the principle of operation of either reference. Accordingly, neither reference teaches, discloses or renders obvious the claimed feature of referencing to respective entries in the reference data set by adding the value of the data field to the synonym set without

intervention of a user before searching for a counterpart, as recited in the independent claims.

In addition, Rogson teaches, with respect to Fig. 8, that the dynamic update list 545 has pairs of words as entries where the user has corrected misspelled words, and the user-corrected word, such as the word “company,” is updated in the static update list only when the user corrects the word more than ten (10) times (paragraph [0032]). The Office Action relies on the teaching of Rogson on paragraph [0032] to teach taking into account writing variations based on quality parameters. However, if the Office Action associates the misspellings with the writing variations, then Rogson fails to teach that the misspellings are taken into account based on quality parameters at least because Rogson does not teach quality parameters. Accordingly, Rogson fails to teach that determining if a synonym candidate and the value of the data field fulfill a predetermined synonym acceptance criterion based on at least one quality parameter, wherein said at least one quality parameter takes into account writing variations that are evaluated based on differences in the value of the data field and the synonym candidate, as recited in the independent claims.

The Office Action characterizes the Rogson reference by asserting that “[i]t is quite inherent that later searches with similar input query would then also be compared with the newly updated dictionary file” (Office Action, page 5, lines 12-14). Accordingly Rogson does not compare the value of a field in the input data to a synonym that has already been updated based on the same input. Thus, Rogson fails to teach that if the synonym set was updated, said comparison to the synonym set comprises comparison

to the updated synonym set in the computer readable database, as recited in the independent claims.

For at least a combination of the above reasons, a combination of Borkovsky and Rogson fails to arrive at the subject matter of independent claims 1 and 21-31. In addition, Toner, Bellany and Murakami, alone or in combination, fail to cure the deficiencies in Rogson and Borkovsky in disclosing or rendering obvious the above-discussed features of independent claims 1 and 21-31. Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 21-31 are patentable over all the applied references. Claims 2-5 and 7-20, at least for their dependence on patentable claim 1, are thus also patentable. Accordingly, all the pending claims are patentable, and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

If for any reason the Examiner feels the application is not in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that he contact the undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case. In the event that any fees are due with respect to this paper, please charge Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing Atty. Docket No. 108800.00007.

Respectfully submitted,



Tarik M. Nabi
Registration No.: 55,478

Customer No. 04372
ARENT FOX LLP
1050 Connecticut Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 857-6395
Email: DCIPDocket@arentfox.com

GEO:TMN